

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

BRYAN REDDY, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AMERICAN EXPRESS NATIONAL
BANK, *et al.*,

Case No. 2:25-cv-455
Judge Edmund A. Sargus, Jr.
Magistrate Judge Kimberly A. Jolson

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Bryan Reddy’s Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (“Motion”). (ECF No. 1.) The Magistrate Judge issued an Order and Report and Recommendation recommending that the Court deny Mr. Reddy’s Motion and granted him thirty days to obtain counsel for Plaintiffs BeeTrans LLC and Bryan VaShaun Reddy Living Estate. (ECF No. 3.)

For the reasons stated in this Opinion and Order, the Court **ADOPTS** and **AFFIRMS** the Magistrate Judge’s Order and Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 3.) Mr. Reddy’s Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* is **DENIED**. (ECF No. 1.)

I. Background

Mr. Reddy, proceeding *pro se*, filed the Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and a Notice of Removal on April 28, 2025. (ECF Nos. 1; 1-1.) He filed the Motion as the “Executor and Sole Beneficiary” of the Bryan VaShaun Reddy Living Estate (“the Estate”). (ECF No. 1.) Mr. Reddy also filed a Complaint in this action on behalf of the Estate against Defendants Stephen J. Squeri (CEO of American Express), Zwicker & Associates, P.C., Christophe Le Caillec (CFO of American Express), and BNY Mellon. (ECF No. 1-3, PageID 13–

22; *see* ECF No. 1-26.)

Mr. Reddy identifies two cases against him that he removed from the Franklin County Municipal Court: 2025 CVF 016138 and 2025 CVF 18526, both breach of contract actions brought against Mr. Reddy by American Express National Bank. (ECF No. 1-1, PageID 9.) In the 2025 CVF 016138 case, the Bank also named BeeTrans LLC as a Defendant. *See Am. Exp. Nat'l Bank v. Reddy*, No. 2025 CVF 016138 (Franklin Cnty. Com. Pl. April 3, 2025). Summons of process in a third case brought by the Bank against Mr. Reddy and against BeeIn Kicks LLC, 2025 CVF 22692, was served on Mr. Reddy on May 9, 2025, after Mr. Reddy removed the first two cases to this Court. *See Am. Exp. Nat'l Bank v. Reddy*, No. 2025 CVF 022692 (Franklin Cnty. Com. Pl. May 9, 2025).

On April 29, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued an Order and Report and Recommendation (“Order and R&R”) recommending that the Court deny the motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* as to Plaintiffs Mr. Reddy, Bryan VaShaun Reddy Living Estate, and BeeTrans LLC. (ECF No. 3.) She observed that Mr. Reddy “provides little information on his salary and monthly expenses,” says he does not “have a paycheck” and is “a Minister of United Peace Affiliates North,” has \$2,500 in cash-on-hand, and reports that his spouse makes at least \$2,000 per month. (ECF No. 3, PageID 107–08.) The Magistrate Judge concluded that paying the filing fee would not deprive Mr. Reddy of the necessities of life and recommended that the Court require him to pay the filing fee within seven days of the Court adopting the recommendation. (*Id.* PageID 108–09.)

Additionally, the Magistrate Judge granted the Estate and BeeTrans LLC thirty days to obtain counsel because trusts and limited liability companies may proceed in federal court only through licensed counsel. (*Id.*)

Mr. Reddy timely objected to the Order and Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 5.) He does not contest the Magistrate Judge’s characterization of his income or finances. Instead, he asserts, among other statements, that he “makes no claim under federal benefits, and all funds held are for the benefit of the trust estate.” (ECF No. 5, PageID 118.) He does not directly contest the order requiring the Estate and BeeTrans LLC to obtain counsel. (*See* ECF No. 5.)

II. Legal Standard

A litigant who is the subject of an adverse report and recommendation from a magistrate judge is entitled to de novo review of those portions of the report to which proper objections are made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Upon review, the Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

III. Analysis

The Magistrate Judge stated and applied the correct legal standards for motions for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (*See* ECF No. 3, PageID 108.) She reviewed Mr. Reddy’s representations in the Motion, including his reported cash-on-hand and family income. In the Objection, Mr. Reddy does not refute the Magistrate Judge’s findings, and his arguments against the Order and Report and Recommendation are unsupported by relevant law. For example, he asserts that “individuals have standing to challenge governmental interference with their private rights and sovereign interests.” (ECF No. 5, PageID 115.) Mr. Reddy also claims that he does “not reside within nor operate subject to” the jurisdiction of the United States. (*Id.*) But he does not explain how these assertions render incorrect the Magistrate Judge’s factual findings and conclusions of law. (*Id.*)

The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Mr. Reddy can pay the filing fee without

being deprived of the necessities of life. *See Bush v. Ohio Dep’t of Rehab. & Corr.*, No. 2:05-CV-0667, 2007 WL 4365381, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 10, 2007) (Kemp, M.J.) (“*In forma pauperis* status is usually reserved either for indigent prisoners or for persons who subsist on small fixed-income payments such as social security, unemployment compensation, or public assistance and who would truly be required to forego food, shelter, clothing, or some other necessity were they to devote any of their scant resources to paying a judicial filing fee.”). With the cash-on-hand and familial income reported by Mr. Reddy, along with his other representations in his Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis*, Mr. Reddy has not shown that he would be so deprived. Mr. Reddy’s Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* is **DENIED**.

Additionally, to the extent Mr. Reddy moves for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on behalf of the Estate and BeeTrans LLC, or any other entities, the Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that the Motion should be denied as to those entities. (ECF No. 3, PageID 109.) Neither a trust nor a limited liability company can proceed *in forma pauperis*. *Rowland v. Cal. Men’s Colony, Unit II Men’s Advisory Council*, 506 U.S. 194, 196 (1993) (“[O]nly a natural person may qualify for treatment *in forma pauperis* under [28 U.S.C.] § 1915.”). To the extent that Mr. Reddy requests *in forma pauperis* status on behalf of the Estate or BeeTrans LLC, the Motion is **DENIED**.

Last, Mr. Reddy does not contest the Magistrate Judge’s Order requiring the Estate and BeeTrans LLC to obtain counsel. That Order remains in effect.

IV. Conclusion

The Court **ADOPTS** and **AFFIRMS** the Magistrate Judge’s Order and Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 3.) Mr. Reddy’s Objection is **OVERRULED**. (ECF No. 5.) Mr. Reddy’s Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* is **DENIED** as to Mr. Reddy, the Estate, and BeeTrans LLC. (ECF No. 1.) The Court **ORDERS** Mr. Reddy to pay the filing fee **within**

seven days of this Opinion and Order. Failure to do so may result in dismissal of his claims against Defendants.

This case remains open.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

7/14/2025
DATE

s/Edmund A. Sargus, Jr.
EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE